

Attachment to OBBA 16633

SUBJEST: Talk with S of 7 Dec 1951

DATE: 17 Dec 1951 (Notes were made during and after the talk)

1. According to his previous promise S consented and criticized the Prologue-publication he had the opportunity to read. With a few exceptions his opinion about them was, in general, positive. Moreover, in comparison with some other emigree-publications he was known here. In particular S was very critical about "Sloboda peremohy", "Ukrainiaki Vistti" and "Ukrainiak slovo" (A Paris-newspaper whose title S was unable to remember exactly). "Krystivenskiy holos" was to him unworthy of any commenting at all. Even its language seemed to be archaic just like its contents.

"Sloboda peremohy" seemed to be an irresponsible example of yellow press in its worst edition. Besides, its political line is out of date, inconsistent and incompatible with political reality - both - in the Ukraine and abroad, pretentious and misinformative. It has nothing but artificial bellicose propaganda and empty phraseology. It is reactionary, and ~~a typical~~ looks like mouthpiece of West-Ukrainian kurkulshchyna of its worst kind.

The same could be said about all the other Ukrainian emigree-papers S had read, with exception of "Such-snist". The latter is not ideal but seems to be less out of touch with reality, and is "on the level". Its ~~xxx~~ editors and contributors seem to have brains and some sense and perception for needs and tendencies of present time. Its content is very diversified but on the whole the literary part is prevailing. And precisely this material is sometimes ~~xxx~~ of somewhat doubtful value because of its super-modernistic line. Therefore, it would be better to give more space to socio-political problematics which must be of ~~xxx~~

greater importance to all concerned.

2. Before discussing "Suchasnist" in detail S agreed to comment on Prolog-pamphlets;

a. "Myth and Reality". S liked best Djilas and Kolakovskyi. Also other authors were not bad with exception of Roepke. The latter does not fit into the whole context at all. Furthermore, his article at the end of the pamphlet implies that the editors consider it as some sort of a "resume", or final conclusion and summary, of all the former presentations. In S's opinion it was a mistake which devaluated the whole pamphlet. Roepke's tendency is to show that socialism is bad as such and therefore ~~is~~ is in complete disharmony with all the others who basically stick to one sort or the other of socialism or communism. Consequently, by implication, the editors identified themselves with Roepke's views, to their own detriment.

Roepke's weakness lies not only in his explicitly reactionary liberal capitalistic convictions but also in ~~his~~ method and ~~extreme~~ his criticism of style of communism and socialism. His ~~extreme~~ criticism is superficial, unscientific, clerical, fragmentary, and one-sided. It is nonsensical to repudiate any sort of collectivism ~~with~~ some doubtful deliberately arranged "arguments" picked up from the street like Roepke's pointing out to rich shopwindows, lack of issues etc under capitalism. He lacks completely ~~as~~ a historical perspective and has no understanding for the future development of mankind which will have ^{to} turn away more and more from liberalistic individualism and accept some sort of collectivism.

Djilas will find the greatest response in the Ukraine nowadays, ~~and~~ in all sections of the population. Kolakovskyi is also very good but his writings are above all for intellectual circles and not for wide masses.

b. "Ukraina - suchasne i maibutnie". The Section of programmatical stuff of Ukrainian Liberation Movement contains too much phraseology and demagoguery plus some reactionary tendencies. The paragraph on "just, free of any exploitation social order" (point 6) is meaningless as long as this order has been not concretely specified and "materially outlined".

The weakest paragraph is the 7th, on agricultural policy. This is a kurkulist-programme. Reservation about eventual introduction of private ownership in agriculture indicates that the UHVR contemplates eventually to re-institute the class of kurkuls. S is inclined to consider it as a concession to Western capitalists, in particular to Americans. He thinks that Americans are going to introduce capitalism in the Ukraine and the UHVR is afraid to lose American sympathies. Hence all the vague formulations leaving open the whole program to various interpretations. S has no doubt that Americans would support the class of kurkuls.

In the sphere of agricultural system there should be no compromise. The UHVR must say clearly that it is either for re-institution of kulaks or for collective farms. In the former case it has nothing to do in the Ukraine, in the latter - the UHVR must specify that it is for a genuine realization of the Statutes of Collective Farm which is being misused and abused by the present regime. What is needed is not liquidation of collective farms but implementation of principles on which it is based.

Furthermore, there is no basis for reinvigoration of kurkulstvo and not only the working class but also the peasantry will oppose private farms.

After Carl's explanation of respective paragraphs of the program. S stressed again that even so there should be no

implication that private ownership could be re-introduced, not even "by people's will". Asked by Carl why S was so much afraid of this private ownership moreover in view of his statements as to ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ a complete lack of social basis for kurkulstvo, S started to expound that this was not completely so because in case of war or revolution the Americans will try to use "potential remnants" of kurkulstvo to liquidate collective farms. And although the majority of peasantry and the working class will be against ~~the~~ ~~re-introduction~~ of private ownership the kurkul-~~xxxxxx~~ minority by its dynamism, intransigence, and enjoyment of American support can be able to force itself through. Kurkul-class should never be underestimated, it has strong re-vitalizing element which was manifested ~~in~~ ~~itself~~, for instance, after Germany's arrival in the Ukraine ~~in~~ during WW II.

Somewhat pressed by Carl on this point from the angle of "people's will" and his unjustified fear for collective farms ~~if~~ ~~as~~ in accordance with his statements, the majority of peasantry and the whole people would be against private ownership ~~and~~ ~~as~~, S simply replied that to him a complete rejection of private ownership is an axiom, that it is absolutely impossible to have both systems - private and collective - exist and function side by side, that liquidation of collective farms is against state's interests and those should be taken into consideration above all, and that even partial rebirth of private peasantry would impede ~~the~~ further development of society by ~~hampering~~ its transformation into working class. One has to realize that the peasantry under socialism is becoming more and more "assimilated" by working class and a peasant of the future is bound to ~~resemble~~ and finally join the basic fabric of society, i.e. the working class.

And when S is afraid of private ownership in agriculture however small and negligible it would be so only because even then kolkulstvo would negatively influence the collective system, complicate agricultural policy, and eventually lead to liquidation of collective farms. This would mean regress, rebirth and accentuation of new social conflicts and antagonisms, and consequently impediment and undermining of any social progress. In the interest of Ukrainian nation which suffered so much from social antagonisms in the past it is imperative to eliminate anything that could be conducive to their eventual re-appearance.

S doubts whether during a turmoil following revolution or war the people's will could manifest itself indeed. Majority and minority in a democracy are very relative phenomena. Dynamism, power, pressure etc. might benefit minority, and on the other hand majority is not always right.

Referring to democracy, as it is being outlined in the pamphlet, S thinks that it is ~~mostly~~ treated by the UHWR as some sort of ~~a~~ fetish. To his mind it should be ~~aspired~~ ^{with an understanding that} ~~but~~ ^{not} during any ~~part~~ ^{furthermore} of transformation it cannot be implemented and moreover ~~at the expense~~ establish a really powerful and orderly state. Probably a dictatorship will be needed. Actually the people do not want democracy in the western sense. What they want is strong authority in their interest, a viable dictatorship of majority over minority. To-day it is vice-versa and this status must be reversed.

In the pamphlet, democracy resembles somewhat its French sort after WW II and shows too many anarchistic features. The UHWR should state clearly that it is aiming at strong governmental system based on majority of people.

Another essential point which needs a complete ~~rectification~~^{rectification} is that dealing with industrial and commercial systems. There can be no talking about private ownership, however negligible, in industry and commerce, not even within a ~~regulated~~ ^{restricted and} regulated by law framework.

Working people are not interested in establishment of private enterprises which again, could only exacerbate social relations. The people want elimination of exploiting instrumentum in their places of work and just remuneration. They refuse, however, any sort of capitalism which would eventually mitigate but not remove the exploitation as such.

The respective point in the program seems to be the weakest one. It also is the most negative. There is nothing to be changed in the present "theoretical" socio-economic system of the USSR which is sound and meets the interests and desires of the working masses. It has only to be put from theory and propaganda into reality.

On the whole there are too many generalities and propagandistic gimmicks in the program. One talks very much about democracy, welfare of the people, just order etc. but this is not enough. The people in the Ukraine are used to those slogans propagated to them for 40 years in one form or another. What is needed is a practical substantial outline of individual points which would appeal to the people in a direct and concrete way. Nice words are not sufficient and one has to tell the people what is meant by these words in practice.

One has also to be ~~realistic~~^{more} realistic in the program, as a paragraph against police-system, KGB and cetera. Of course, we are against Russian police-system, against Russian KGB, against abuses of power etc. But at the same time we must realize that we shall have to have our own Ukrainian KGB, and S cannot imagine a state

without an effective police system. This does not imply that one should write about it in the programme but in such cases it is better to omit the whole problem. Otherwise, someone preaching abolition of political police fighting the enemies of the state, is either a hypocrite or ^{an} ignorant in state-affairs.

The historical and other informative articles in the pamphlet are very good for the people in the Ukraine and much more of such material should be published.

The article on decentralization seems to be rather superficial and betrays some lack of knowledge. It is also too strongly tinged with propagandistic tendencies.

Very good is the article on "Social justice" (I.B. No 11, 1957, pp.23, 24).

On the other hand "~~the~~ state ownership - the main cause of social injustice in the USSR" (pp.24) is nonsensical and simply stupid.

"Sovietske dvorianstvo" is very good and this problem should be expanded wider and deeper. It would recommend not to use the word "sovietskyi" in all cases but substitute it with "radayanskyi". Only when it has to have a pointed derogatory meaning one should use "sovietskyi".

Also some economic articles reflect a superficial treatment of respective material. It is foolish, for instance, to say that time and not product itself should determine remuneration of a worker. Sometimes a worker prefers to be paid for his production or more precisely for productive unit and not for hours of work. There are many similar practical questions ^{which} it is better to leave to the particular situations and avoid generalizations and sweeping

conclusions.

It is also wrong to draw comparisons only with particular figures ~~that~~ ^{at date} that are advantageous to a writer or his purpose. Thus, for instance, when writing about ~~the~~ living standard in the Soviet Union, the latter is being always compared with that of Canada or the USA. Why there are no comparisons with living standards in Brazil or Spain? Such an attitude smells after demagoguery and prearranged simplification. To improve the living standard one has to have means for that. Production, or better to say, ^{the} volume of production, ~~and~~ national product, determines the living standard. If one has no cars and houses one cannot distribute them. ~~So~~ ^{that} it was known Gomulka who said that he would like to grant every Pole an abundance of food and luxury but he ~~could not~~ ^{could not} do it because simply he ~~was~~ didn't have them. The main thing is proper economic development and this, sometimes, cannot be achieved at once.

Very good is the article on "Podatkovyi polekshi sovietskykh milioneriv" ("IB" No 11, 1957, pp. 27, 28, 29, 30).

Also very useful and positive the stuff on pp. 32 - 33 (from recent Ukrainian history).

Chapter II is in general good but Zhivago could have been omitted. He is a representative of pre-revolutionary period and sounds quaint. Too rightist and "too antique" for the present generation. Very good is here Kolakowski.

Section about "Fakty pro dijsnist' v Ukrainsi" (pp. 47-52) is very good. In particular the article about Russification. Somewhat weaker is the article on "Yalmyut ukrainski hazety" p. 57. It betrays ~~the~~ lack of ^{knowledge of} facts and proper background of press-policy

in the Ukraine. There ~~is~~ no direct impediment to distribution of the Ukrainian press but it's being done in a more subtle and complicated manner.

Very good is the article "De ye ukrainske vijisko?", p.60.

The article about Russification with reference to the press - on page 61 - is again somewhat superficial and oversimplified. It reflects lack of knowledgeability and an inclination to simplified conclusions. For instance, it would be too dangerous to make a judgment on the progress of Russification ~~ky~~ in different places by comparing simply such ~~mechanic~~ data ~~as~~ as oblast or rayon press in Ukrainian and in Russian.

Very good is the article on "Reabilitacija" p.52, and on Pavlovish.

The article on Ukrainian abroad seems to be too pretentious and too optimistic, moreover when it contains at the same time an enumeration of all the political groups abroad. There are absolutely too many of them and it must create the impression that there is something wrong with Ukrainian politics abroad. It substantiates also the Soviet claim that ~~Ukrainians~~ do quarrel very much ~~among~~ themselves and this is their main field of "political activity".

Good is the article on page 79.

"Zakhidni derzhavy zaznavuyut ..." on page 85 is again too pretentious, too complacent, and actually ~~deceitful~~. It entails a strong dosage of selfidolatry and "sakoreklama" and is bound to deceit the people in the Ukraine. S wishes it would be that good in reality, but unfortunately this is not the case. There is too great a gulf between the ~~Ukrainian~~ ~~Ukrainian~~ ~~Ukrainian~~ affairs in the free world and ~~Ukrainian~~ presentation in the article.

It is better to tell the people the truth however deplorable it is instead of creating false and unjustified hopes.

"Vidnoivid' oaskvilantam" is very good, particularly two first articles. There was, however, no need to whitewash Ulas Samchuk whose reputation in the Ukraine remained very bad. There is no point in denying that he collaborated with Hitlerites and did dirty jobs.

Good is "The Answer to Smolytch" and not bad "Falshivnyky istorii prava" on page 102.

On the other hand the excerpts from UPA-leaflets are not "on the level" and could have been better. It was wrong to demand from the people at that time to take arms and rise against the ~~Russians~~ because there were no chances to beat them. This understood very well the populace in the Eastern Ukraine and therefore the UPA could mobilize only in the Western Ukraine which ~~had~~ had too short an experience with the Soviet system.

c) "Pytannia natsionalnoyi polityky ..." by Markus and Pelenskyi. Very good material and more of such stuff is needed.

d) "Na bahrianiomu koni revolutsiyi" by Kravtsov. Very positive, excellent. More and more of such stuff should be published.

e) "Krov i chornyylo" by Rakhmannyi. It was probably published for emigration and the Western world in general. There is little for the people in the Ukraine. Only some of the articles would be of interest to Ukrainians at home, like e.g. "Chomu Rosiya potrebuje chasu i myru" pp.135-139.

S thought that Rakhmannyi deliberately distorted Poltava by implying that the latter did not reject capitalism in general. In particular on page 113 Rakhmannyi tries to "polish" Poltava's

socialist convictions, probably, in order to ingratiate the UHVR with American capitalists. Toltava put his view in a clear and explicit form whereas Rakhamannyi "rozmazuye".

Also on page 108 the latter exaggerates while describing the extent of UPA-activities after WW II. It is perhaps right for propagandistic purpose in the West but it would kill the purpose in the Ukraine where the people know exactly how strong it ~~has~~ ^{has} been on what territory ~~acted~~. Consequently, this would be considered as a lie and could be also used against the Ukrainian liberation movement by the Russians.

3. Powers presented himself as a real coward. S cannot justify his behaviour and so think all the people in the Soviet Union. He is also considered ~~a~~ ^{to be} typical representative of Americans who are too fond of their lives and comfort. On this occasion the people were mentioning the fact that they (Americans) were beaten at one time even by Germans (at the end of the war) and then by Chinese in Korea. S himself is of a rather low opinion about the courage and persistence of American soldier. He doesn't think they know how to fight.

About a year before Powers was shot down over Sverdlovsk, American planes, like that of Powers, were also flying over Kiev. The same happened also in winter 1961. The Soviet AAs tried to get them but were powerless. On the whole the Kiev AAs (PVO) ~~was~~ equipped pretty badly and lack modern ~~expensive~~ armament. The Sverdlovsk AAs was equipped with modern weapon and therefore succeeded in getting Powers down.

4. S does not believe in assertions of American papers that there is concentration of rocket-bases in the Ukraine.

This is an American invention to justify destruction of the Ukraine in the future war. There are three reasons for which the American press is being told to fabricate such "image" about the Ukraine:

- a) the Ukraine has a highly developed industry of a very great importance for defence;
- b) the USA must look for a plausible justification of eventual complete destruction of this defence potential already to-day;
- c) the USA is determined to knock out the Ukraine as a future economic competitor.

The USA is not interested in Ukrainian cause and it is useless to try to do anything to convince the Americans that in this case they are absolutely wrong. They have simply the Ukraine ~~is~~ "v zhoni". All should be directed to strengthening Ukrainian potential in the Ukraine itself and perhaps then, eventually, also blind Americans will pay us proper attention. But S doubts because the American interests are incompatible with ours.

There are no missile-bases in the Carpathian Mountains. S knows the Carpathians pretty well but he nowhere came across a "zabretnaya zona". He knows what it is like because he happened to serve with the Army in one of "zabretna zones". S did not specify where it was and when, saying only "at one place". He also implied that it was not a missile-basis. Just "ordinary" zabretna zona. Besides, his uncle is "vovennyi" and has great interest in military fairs. The uncle told S that military equipment in the Ukraine is "too old".

has
S knows Carpathians since 1953 as he ~~has~~ travelled very much ~~there~~ and made many excursions.

5. It is a pity Beria did not win in internal struggle for power in the Kremlin. He was going to elevate ~~national~~ ^{non-Russian} elements in the party and government and his plans were very far-reaching. Although he had a bad reputation as one of Stalin's henchmen, at the same time, he was respected by many people for his brains and courage. Beria was the one who liquidated Yezhov and the only one who dared to stand up to Stalin if necessary. Thus, for instance, even before WWII Beria told publicly that we should not put all the responsibility for mishaps and shortcomings in industry and agriculture only on foreign agents and saboteurs but one had to look deeper into our system of conducting our economic life. Beria would have had it much easier to whitewash himself now, much easier than Khrushchev who had ~~many~~ more crimes on his record.

6. The planned purge in the Ukraine and elsewhere in 1952, after the 18th Party-Congress, was primarily to be directed against Jews but not Ukrainians. Sosura and Rylskyi were in critical situation in 1949 but they managed to survive.

7. In its propaganda for the Ukraine "Brolog" should concentrate now on material against Russification, informations about the 22nd Congress and its consequences, mainly on internal disruptions within the socialist block, and on the program of the CPSU itself, including such questions as, e.g. why the rights and welfare of the working people ~~and~~ dealt there at the very end, and how? ~~Concerning~~ The aims of the program are positive but how is it in reality?

8. S asked Carl whether his people has ever thought about using repatriants from Latin America for a political work in the Ukraine. Carl pointed to the difficulties in this ~~area~~ sphere but

according to S it would be, eventually, worthwhile, taking into account that all repatriants get easily assimilated and they are usually trusted by the regime.

9. S knows young writers and poets in Kiev from whom he could get their works to be published abroad. He doesn't ~~know~~ anybody ~~know~~ from famous and established intellectual circles.

10. Still before June 1957 Khrushchev complained in party-information about Malenkov who was described as ~~good~~ but unable for governmental job party-member. S read it himself, although he was not entitled to.

There are various kinds of party internal information-bulletins. Mostly they are in red covers and with inscriptions on: "not for the press" or "secret" or "top secret".

11. Personal plans. Above all S wants to acquire proper knowledge of English to get a job in his profession. He wants to be independent and, to his mind, times passed by when Lenin could sit in Switzerland and do with capitalist money what he wanted without being compelled to take orders from anybody. As to "prolog", of course, he would like to co-operate but first he must get more familiar with its political line. Carl himself told him that not all there are of same opinions and views as Carl. Anyway S is going to be politically active as soon as he settles down. In principle he would like to ~~xxx~~ collaborate with the "Prolog" ~~when~~ judging by the stuff he read till now.